

## REMARKS

### **Rejection Under 35 USC § 112**

Claim 12 is amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC § 112. Please refer to page 36 of the application for additional description corresponding to the recited elements of claim 12.

### **Double Patenting Rejection**

A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection.

### **Rejection of Claims 11-18 Under 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 11-14 were rejected as allegedly obvious over Treynor in view of Wong. Claim 11 is amended to overcome the rejection. While Treynor discloses a linked list, such list does not have the node structure of Applicant's invention. The node structure can be understood by reference to Fig. 10 of the current application and corresponding text. Thus, as amended, claim 11 defines over Treynor and the other references of record. Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and therefore define over the references of record for the same reason.

Claim 15 was rejected as allegedly obvious over Treynor in view of Wong and Bereznyi. Bereznyi fails to cure the deficiency of Treynor as discussed above. Claim 15 depends from claim 11 and therefore defines over the references of record for the same reason.

Claims 16-18 were rejected as allegedly obvious over Treynor in view of Wong and Huberman. Huberman fails to cure the deficiency of Treynor as discussed above. Claims 16-18 depend from claim 11 and therefore define over the references of record for the same reason.

### **Rejection of Claims 21-31 Under 35 USC § 102(e)**

Claims 21-31 were rejected as allegedly anticipated by Malkin. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

With regard to claims 21-25, contrary to the assertion on page 9, last paragraph of the Official Action, Malkin col. 8, line 38 to col. 9, line 10 does not disclose "a profile server operative to receive a hint request..." as required by claim 21. There is no hint request in

Malkin. Instead, as stated in Malkin col. 8 lines 50-52, “The content servers generates and provide a prefetch hint information (PHI) with the requested object.” This implies that Malkin’s content servers automatically include PHI with a requested object, instead of including such information in response to a specific request as required by claim 21. Claims 22-25 are dependent on claim 21 and define over Malkin for the same reason.

With regard to claims 26-31, Malkin lines 3-10 simply does not disclose storing a component element node in the component cache, as alleged by the Official Action page 11, last paragraph. Applicant requests reconsideration of this allegation. The cited portion of Malkin does not discuss a storing operation at all. Claims 27 – 31 depend from claim 26 and define over Malkin for the same reason.

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in light of the various amendments and remarks herein.

Date: December 15, 2006

/Ari Long/

Nathaniel Ari Long  
Registration No. 53,233

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439

© 2006 WW